

Meeting Minutes

UBC DEVELOPMENT PERMIT BOARD (DP BOARD)

Date: October 14, 2020
Time: 5:00 pm – 7:00 PM
Place: Virtual Meeting (Zoom)

Board Members:

Bryce Rositch	Chair/Former Board of Governors
John Metras	Vice-Chair/Member of UBC Administration
Jason Adle	UBC Vancouver Student
Andre Gravelle	General UBC Academic Community
Michael White	Ex-Officio - Associate Vice-President, Campus + Community Planning
Kyle Bruce	UBC Resident

Applicants:

Nathan Ma	UBC Properties Trust
Sepehr Rad	UBC Properties Trust
Paul Young	UBC Properties Trust
Diona Fong	UBC Properties Trust
James Tait	UBC Athletics

Presenters:

Richard Findlay	Richard Findlay Landscape Architecture
Patrick Cotter	ZGF Architects
Sophia Zhu	ZGF Architects
Michael Patterson	Perry + Associates

Staff:

Grant Miller	Director of Planning, Development Services
Karen Russell	Manager, Development Services
Penny Martyn	Manager, Green Buildings
Paul Cloutier	Planning Assistant, Development Services (Recorder)

1. **Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda**

The Vice-Chair brought the meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

A motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously for the approval of the Agenda.

2. **Approval of Previous Minutes**

A motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously for the approval of the Minutes of the February 4, 2020 Development Permit Board Meeting.

3. **Development Permit Applications**

3.1. DP07030-3 – Nobel Park Softball Field Upgrades

Development Services staff introduced the project to the Board and outlined the public consultation process, including pre-application open house, initial feedback, post-application online consultation, and concerns outlined in the public feedback summary. Concerns were expressed by residents concerning community access, including the need for outdoor non-programmed space during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

This introduction was followed by the presentation of the proposed field improvements by Richard Findlay Landscape Architecture. Proposed improvements include foul netting, bullpens, covered dugouts, revised field dimensions and materials, and pads for temporary portable toilets and bleachers.

Questions and Comments from the Board:

Is there a performance expectation for community access to be tied to the development permit to ensure residents can continue to use the amenity? There is a concern that while usage may be maintained in the short term, in the long term, with staff turnover, community access could be reduced. And what is the visual impact of the netting?

- Athletics: There is to be a Memorandum of Understanding concerning use between the University Neighbourhood Association and UBC Athletics. The schedule will be posted online and the residents will be able to book programmed use of the field through UNA Recreation. Also there will not be any practice or games during the summer months.
- Landscape: The netting should fade into the background due to reduced pipe diameter.

The Memorandum of Understanding should be referenced in the Development Permit.

Regarding the temporary portable toilets, how will they be used? Is there a plan for a permanent facility?

- Athletics: The portable toilets will be brought in for the weekend game days and removed afterwards. A permanent facility would need to be developed in association with the UNA.
- Development Services: While there has been advocacy concerning permanent toilets by residents, there does not seem to be an urgency for such a facility from UNA due to high capital cost.

The washroom situation needs to be well managed and it seems Athletics has it handled.

UNOS (University Neighbourhood Open Space) was originally designated exclusively for community use. It does seem that the UNA and the park are being asked to solve Athletics' problem of not having space for the women's softball team. If the community is to be asked to accommodate such a significant tenant, what is the community getting in return for the time lost? A performance measure is needed as when the neighbourhood experiences further growth, the community may be upset with the limitations.

- Athletics: Athletics is trying to minimize disruption and accommodate after school use with no practices after 3:30 pm. There will only be 12 games days over the February to mid-May playing season and the improved field will be available all of the summer.
- Properties Trust: Initially, during the original public engagement, the Athletics' softball schedule was not available, but has since been made available and the UNA is satisfied with it. When not in use by Athletics, the field will be bookable through the UNA. It won't be secured, so will also be available for general use. There is also an approved

park coming to the BC research lands and Properties Trust will be hydroseeding undeveloped lots that will be open to the public.

- Development Services: the covid environment seems to have heightened sensitivity regarding access to unprogrammed space.

Will the UNA have the resources to negotiate an MOU to their satisfaction?

- Development Services: Yes, the UNA have staff able to do that.

A couple of questions. Was there a shortlist of other locations and is the pad ready for a more permanent bathroom facility?

- Properties Trust: The pad isn't concrete, just a granular foundation, and would need services. Unfortunately, it won't help in preparing for a permanent facility.
- Athletics: There was a review of other possible sites, however no other options were appropriate in terms of the required size.

The Chair opened the floor to questions and comments from the public. There were no questions or comments.

The Chair moved to endorse the recommendation that the Director of Planning, Development Services, issue a Development Permit DP07030-3 for softball field upgrades to Nobel Park, conditional on UBC Athletics and the University Neighbourhoods Association completing a Memorandum of Understanding regarding use of the field and respective responsibilities.

The motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously.

3.1. DP20022 – BCR9 Faculty and Staff Housing

Development Services introduced the project to the Board including a summary of the virtual public open house and comments received via the online comment form. It is highlighted the project is a neighbour to, and shares a common courtyard with, the BCR8 Evolve faculty and staff housing project presented previously to the Board. Also highlighted are the requested variances for encroachment into the 2.5 m setbacks for the northwest and northeast corners and need to reconcile tree removals.

ZGF presented the architectural design of the building to the Board:

This presentation begins with an explanation of the desire to complement the pedestrian realm along Grey Avenue as well as the pathway to the future park. This is accomplished by having a cantilevered frame above the 2nd level, providing a datum that creates a visual expansion of the ground plane.

It is noted that the grading of the site was utilized to provide a pedestrian/cyclist access to the parkade level. This change in grade is responded to in the landscaping through terraced and stepped planting.

In order to allow a shared continuous courtyard with BCR8, it is explained that the building was initially designed with an L-shape. This resulted in a higher percentage of deep units with inboard bedrooms. The current stepped L-shape reduces this need. For those units still having inboard bedrooms it is noted that the units are based on existing prototyped units toured by the firm and Properties Trust. The deep unit design presented has also had daylighting analysis showing similar levels when compared to conventional unit depths.

The variances requested are also described. The framed elements are discussed to not just be aesthetic devices, but contain habitable space and are part of the massing strategy. This approach was endorsed by AUDP. The projection of the area separation walls into the setback is also mentioned. Drawing on previous projects, a request is also made for reducing the number of visitor and accessible parking stall to better suit anticipated demand.

Perry and Associates followed with a presentation of the landscape design:

The primary aim of the landscape design for the project is to combine the courtyard with BCR8, necessitating a redesign of BCR8's courtyard to integrate the two sites and address the grade transitions between them. The design also seeks to manage storm water as only the roof water is to be directed into the stormwater drainage.

Questions and Comments from the Board:

No comments regarding the design. When is the neighbouring land and BCR7 anticipated to be constructed?

- Properties Trust: With the market conditions there is a reluctance to develop any further rental at the moment. Development of the former BC research lands will be ongoing until approximately 2026. The western side is to be faculty and staff housing and eastern side will be market. BCR7 will be the last site to be developed, so likely over 6 years. The soil processing that has been occurring on site is coming to an end with the top soil being distributed and hydroseeded. There will be fencing and consolidation of the existing landscaping compound.

When will the alternative parkade plan be utilized? Will there be EV charging in the parkade? Is any of the wood being used reclaimed?

- Properties Trust: There will be monitoring of the bicycle demand. If there is a need for a conversion of parking to bicycle storage space, it is possible. For EV charging there will be four level 2 ready outlets. There is no reclaimed wood in the design.

The design is visually appealing. There does seem to be a discrepancy in the report which states the units have a range up to 1,800 sq. ft. Is this supposed to be 1,300 sq. ft.? The inboard bedrooms are concerning.

- Properties Trust: A few of the corner units are approximately 1,800 sq. ft. These would be similar to the existing junior 1 bedroom units with dens. The inboard bedrooms were a compromise to allow narrower smaller units to provide space for larger 3-4 bedroom units, but still meet unit counts, though these have to be at the corners. During these covid times there is a greater demand for larger units, but these are restricted to exterior corners. In the latest faculty and staff development, Mundell House, the 2 bedroom units were the last to rent as the demand has seemed to change.
- ZGF: The actual units are modelled on units that were toured near the University of Washington. We are confident it has addressed lighting levels in the 24/144 units. [In the chat it was noted that inboard bedrooms will have interior clerestory windows].

Thank you. It's good that the 3 and 4 bedrooms are included. The number of EV chargers seems low. It is encouraged that the project pursue the additional 2 REAP points. Has the project achieved Step Code 3?

- Yes, Integral Group reports the project has achieved Step Code 3. The revised massing seems to have allowed the project to achieve Step 3.

Although inboard bedrooms are now allowed according to the BC Building Code, these are usually incorporated with things like translucent walls. The City of Vancouver is not allowing inboard bedrooms. What happens if these units don't work? There should be the development of residential unit design guidelines to address this.

The larger bedrooms seem to have a very small amount of storage. The four bedrooms seem to have only about 3 linear feet of counter space. This is below what is recommended by BC Housing Corporation Design Guidelines.

As a cyclist, the bicycle repair room and ramp are appreciated, but there is likely going to be a future need to accommodate trailers or cargo bikes. Also, for electric bicycles, are there outlets?

- Properties Trust: Typically a 2.8 FSR building would not have a courtyard so big, so the southern part of the building had to have a wider southern wing to land the density on the site. However the inboard rooms are not necessarily new as in the portfolio dens have been inboard. These have been used as bedrooms but they are not ideal. There are design guidelines in development at the Provost's Office and Properties Trust. The design development is still underway concerning the bicycle charging, but there will be a minimum of 2 chargers per storage room.
- ZGF: A U-shaped building was proposed, but this would create shadowing of the interior portion of the courtyard, which would not be desirable for the units facing this part. Given the constraints of the site and in order to achieve the maximum density and number of units, the deep L-shaped floorplate is considered the best form.

The Chair moved to endorse the recommendation that the Director of Planning, Development Services issue Development Permit DP20022 for the faculty and staff apartment housing on Lot BCR9 in Wesbrook Place.

The motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously.

4. Presentation to the Board by Penny Martyn, Campus and Community Planning Green Building Manager on REAP 3.2 update.

The presentation discussed the upcoming major update to UBC's green building rating regulation for UBC land development - the Residential Environmental Assessment Program (REAP). The update is required to realign the program with UBC's Green Building Action Plan, goals emerging from UBC's climate emergency priorities, and BC Step Code.

Major changes to the program include a requirement for greenhouse gas reporting to help prepare for anticipated REAP 4.0 construction targets. Additionally, the new version will include metering and reporting of energy use and prorated points for renewable electricity production. The scoring has also been revised, now being scored out of a total of 100 points, to make it more intuitive for applicants.

Climate adaptation is also noted as a focus of version 3.2, with points for being 2050 temperature ready, for improved weather resiliency, incorporation of water reduction, and site rainwater management. Health and wellbeing will be included with credits for sustainable landscapes and greenspace, bird friendly design, and building with requirements for additional bicycle storage for larger units.

The presentation also addressed the costing exercise that accompanied the revision. It was found that REAP 3.2 would have the highest incremental costs for high rises in the areas of

renewable energy, highest water use reduction, and enhanced bird friendly design. For low rise buildings, the highest increment cost would similarly be for renewable energy and highest level of water use reduction, and enhanced bird friendly design, as well as site back up power and indoor/outdoor amenities. Next steps to adoption, including the upcoming report to the Board of Governors in December was noted.

There were no questions from the board members following the presentation.

The Chair requests that a memo be submitted outlining the changes in the scoring for REAP 3.2 as compared to REAP 3.1

5. Other Business

The Chair thanks Vice Chair John Metras, General UBC Academic Community member Andre Gravelle, and UBC Vancouver Student member Jason Adle for their service and the completion of their terms.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by the Chair at 7:00 pm.

Minutes prepared by Paul Cloutier, Development Services